DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 909 HE 006 110

AUTHOR Millett, John D.
TITLE Governance and Leadership in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D. C. Management Div.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 7p.; Address to Presidential Seminar, Management Division, Denver and San Francisco, 1974
JOURNAL CIT Management Forum; v3n8 December 1974

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Educational Administration; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; Leadership Responsibility; *University Administration

ABSTRACT

Leadership in the academic community arises from the necessities of the structure of governance within a college or university. It is obvious that the structure of governance comes first, and the leadership role follows from it. Governance is both a structure and a process. It is a structure that legitimates power groups and power relationships. It is a process for making basic decisions about purpose and form of governance, either implicit or explicit. Leadership is also a structure that establishes roles or influences the behavior of other persons in a social unit. It is a process of encouraging, persuading, and even of directing others to make decisions and to perform in accordance with decisions. The only two models for governance and leadership in higher education today are the institutional governance model and the community governance model. Interest in the community governance model is waning at the moment. Yet the institutional governance model will be different in the future from what it has been in the past. It will gradually be replaced by one in which institutional leadership perforce will exert ever more influence on academic affairs. Necessarily, this new kind of institutional leadership will require much more extensive information sharing, more lengthy consultation, and more careful sharing of authority than in the past. (Author/PG)

GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP

management FORUM

MD

EDITOR: WINIFRED THOMPSON

a news/notes digest for institutions of higher education

Throughout this year, the *Management Forum* has dealt with problems of governance in colleges and universities, and particularly with the role of the president in governance. In making available John Millett's address to the Denver and San Francisco presidential seminars given by the Management Division, we hope to provide an overview of the issues in that debate.

GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BY JOHN D. MILLETT

In their study of presidential leadership for the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education, Cohen and March present eight "metaphors of leadership."[1] These metaphors are labeled the competitive market metaphor, the administrative metaphor, the collective bargaining metaphor, the democratic metaphor, the consensus metaphor, the anarchy metaphor, the independent judiciary metaphor, and the plebiscitary autocracy metaphor. These metaphors presumably describe varying styles of leadership the authors observed among the presidents whom they studied. No doubt there are differing styles of leadership even as there are quite different personalities among the individuals who serve as college and university presidents.

I am disposed to argue, however, that leadership in the academic community arises from the necessities of the structure of governance within a college or university. It seems obvious to me that the structure of governance comes first, and that the leadership role follows from it. Descriptions of presidential leadership are not free-standing. Rather, they are imbedded in the whole edifice of governance itself.

Perhaps a few words of definition are in order here. Governance is both a structure and a process. It is a structure legitimatizing power groups and power relationships. It is a process for making basic decisions about purpose, procedure and performance. Every social unit has some form of governance, implicit or explicit. Leadership is also a matter of structure and of process. It is a structure which establishes roles of influence upon the behavior of other persons in a social unit. It is a process of encouraging, persuading, and even of directing others to make decisions and to perform in accordance with decisions.

It seems to me that at the present time we have in higher education only two models for governance and leadership in higher education. For lack of better designations, I shall label one of these the institutional governance model and the other the community governance model. As I read Cohen and March, I believe the authors are presenting essentially the institutional governance model. Indeed, their phrase "organized anarchy" seems to me to refer to the institutional governance model; I wish they had used such a term rather than the one they did employ.

In a little book that I wrote in 1974 I tried to present the major desirable characteristics of a community governance model.[2] My effort has been widely interpreted as advocacy of this particular model. This was not the intention. My objective was to suggest means for making the community governance model more effective, *if* and *when* a college or university decided to undertake this particular form of governance.

In this paper I wish to contrast what I believe to be the important characteristics of these two models of governance and leadership: the institutional governance model and the community governance model. I think these are the two basic choices currently available for colleges and universities. For reasons I shall present later, I think interest in the community governance model is waning at the moment. The institutional governance model then becomes the alternative. Yet I suspect the institutional governance model will be different in the future from what it has been in the past.

The Institutional Governance Model

In his landmark study of 1960, John J. Corson described what he found to be a "dual structure" of governance in the colleges and universities he visited.[3] There was one structure for decision-making about the administrative or institutional affairs of a college or university, and there was another structure for the academic or instructional affairs. Corson identified the board of trustees, the president, and the administrative staff as the structure preoccupied with institutional affairs. And he identified the faculty, especially the faculty organized in departments, as the governance structure preoccupied with instructional and research objectives, instructional and research procedures, faculty selection and promotion, student academic performance, and the fulfillment of degree requirements.

Not long after Corson's volume appeared, Harold Dodds as president emeritus of Princeton University presented his own analysis of the dilemma of the college president: the choice between educator and caretaker.[4] Dodds argued eloquently for a concept of presidential leadership which would emphasize educational leadership. But his sense of realism propelled Dodds to acknowledge that in his own presidential role and in the role he observed played by many other presidents the problems of being a caretaker appeared to dominate presidential performance.

Perhaps Dodds' word "caretaker" is intended to arouse regret or to encourage a different pattern of behavior. I prefer to speak of institutional affairs and of institutional leadership. And I believe that there are two primary explanations why the twentieth century college and university president, particularly in the years since 1920, has been content or has been compelled to restrict his or her role to one of institutional leadership. One of these reasons is the great expansion and specialization of knowledge that has occurred in this century. The other reason has been the perplexing demands of institutional survival for our colleges and universities as organized enterprises.

There is little need to belabor the matter of the expansion of knowledge or of the specialization of scholarship that has been taking place during this century, and especially since the end of World War I. Each of the recognized academic disciplines has gone its own way in the pursuit of knowledge, developing its own techniques of inquiry and its own esoteric vocabulary. Even in the humanities the trend toward specialization of knowledge has been fully evident in the study of literature, in the review of history, and in the speculations of philosophy. Indeed, some imitation of the methods of the biological and physical sciences has appeared in the humanities, and unfortunately the social and behavioral sciences have linked their endeavors increasingly with those of the natural sciences and have largely lost their moorings in the humanities.

There are still among us those who yearn for the Renaissance man, and occasionally there is an individual or two who does endeavor to be at home in several disciplines rather than in one. But the effort to be learned rather than knowledgeable draws more sneers than cheers in the academic community, and an eclectic interest in man and his world is a pastime for the retired and the frustrated journalists among us, rather than the pursuit of a serious scholar. The academic community shares a common environment, a particular college or university, but it shares little else.

And as the disciplines have intensified their specialization and depth of knowledge, so have the professions. Look for a moment only at law, engineering, and medicine, although the same kinds of development are clearly evident in many other professions such as architecture, the performing arts, the agricultural sciences, nursing, social work, education, business management, dentistry, veterinary medicine—yes, even theology. The professions at the beginning of this century were largely an art form in which skill based upon personal experience was partly acquired through a formal process of learning together, in groups called schools. Then increasingly the professions became grounded in the disciplines, in the practical application of the knowledge being accumulated by scholars. The study of law found inspiration from the social sciences; the study of engineering drew ever more heavily upon the physical sciences; and the practice of medicine became dependent upon the biological sciences. More recently, in the past twenty years especially, professional study has tended to identify itself ever more closely with the relevant disciplines, faculty members becoming scholars in their own right and students learning more about the methods of knowledge than about the uses of knowledge. As a consequence, we hear a great deal today about lawyers uncomfortable in the court room, engineers uninterested in production lines, and doctors unconcerned about the delivery of patient care.

For at least sixty years, and especially in the past thirty years, higher education in our country has indulged itself in an orgy of scholarship. I fear that we in higher education have become more enamoured of knowledge for its own sake than dedicated to the constructive use of knowledge for the well-being of others. But my interest here is the impact of these events upon individual colleges and universities as structures of governance. And the impact I think is

clear. Governance has been fragmented, even as has been scholarship. And the leadership of a single person as president, even of a group of persons as an administrative team, has been restricted to manageable institutional affairs.

The other force in the life of our colleges and universities throughout this century greatly influencing institutional leadership has been the struggle for survival. Until the advent of World War II faculty members were largely content to accept and pursue the profession of scholarship as one of genteel poverty. Colleges and universities tended to be relatively small in size, and were required to live upon the basis of the munificence of a few very wealthy philanthropists or upon the pinch-penny crumbs provided by state legislators. The disaster of the 1929 depression made faculty members grateful for security and less resentful of their modest expectations.

Since 1940 the life of colleges and universities has been one of bust and boom: the loss of male students to the demands of war and the sudden overwhelming numbers of returning veterans; the needs of war-time research and then contraction; the demands of technological and scientific advancement after 1957 and the curtailment of this interest in 1968 and thereafter; the tidal wave of students in the early 1960's and the loss of students in the early 1970's; the generosity of governments and the loss of interest by governments; rising expectations of society and contracting expectations; student discontent and even disruption and student withdrawal; the clamor for admission by the disadvantaged and by minorities and the disillusionment of acceptance; the demands of employers for more educated talent and the sudden emergence of labor market surpluses of college graduates; and throughout all the period the ravages of now virulent, occasionally quiescent, inflation. It is a miracle of determination and of fortitude that our colleges and universities have survived all of these vicissitudes. And they have survived in large part because of dedicated, well-meaning, and hard-working administrators. In an ever changing social environment presidents have been hard pressed to keep their colleges and universities functioning as enterprises, as discrete organizational entities with buildings to be built, budgets to be balanced, faculties to be maintained, students to be recruited and cared for, alumni to be reassured, the general public to be placated.

There is little wonder that presidents became caretakers in the very best sense of that word. There was a great deal of caretaking to be done and no one else to do it. Institutional leadership was essential and presidents responded, I think nobly and fully, to the need. If our colleges and universities survive today as they do, it is because of the quality of their institutional leadership.

The dual structure of governance based upon a differentiation of academic affairs and institutional affairs was a necessary and effective response to the circumstances and conditions of higher education in this century in the United States.

I think it may be fairly said that the dual organization model for the governance structure of higher education proved itself inadequate to the circumstances of the 1960's. Two major changes took place in American higher education in that stormy decade. One was a remarkable increase in higher education enrollments from 3.6 million students in 1960 to 8.6 million students in 1970. The other was the student revolution, a revolution occasioned not so much by mere numbers as by a substantial cultural shift in attitudes and behavior.

There is no need here to analyze, or to evaluate, these changes. Let us accept them simply as facts subject to a variety of interpretations as to causal forces. What is relevant here again is the impact of these changes upon the governance structures of colleges and universities. The impact was considerable. Suddenly, colleges and universities began to experiment with new forms of governance.

Without attempting to consider the generalization in anything like the detail it deserves, let me simply repeat that the dual organization structure of the 1940's and 1950's suddenly revealed fatal flaws in the 1960's when colleges and universities entered upon their times of trouble. The dual organization structure recognized two kinds of activities within a college or university and distributed the authority to deal with these activities to two organizational entities. On the one hand, there was the domain of academic affairs and these were the province of the faculty. On the other hand there was the domain of administrative affairs, and these were the province of the president and board of trustees, along with a staff of administrative associates. The linkage was provided ostensibly in the person of the president, who was simultaneously presiding officer of the faculty, administrative chief of supporting operations, and professional adviser to the board of trustees.

The deficiency in this arrangement was revealed glaringly and fully when colleges and universities suddenly were confronted with student dissatisfaction and student disruption. Whose task was it to meet student demands — administration or the faculty? Was campus disorder an administrative affair or a faculty affair? And when the president took action to meet circumstances of campus disorder, he or she almost at once encountered faculty criticism and even faculty counter-action. Students who had no legitimate power in a governance structure divided between academic affairs and administrative affairs insisted upon participation in academic governance. And both faculty members and students began to challenge administrative authority, expressing doubts about its legitimacy and even denying its importance.

The events of the 1960's can be understood in terms of that concept of organized anarchy put forth by Cohen and

March. A college or university is an organization only in a certain limited sense. A college or university is an anarchy only in a certain limited sense. Contradictory as the two words in tandem may seem, they nonetheless convey a certain reality about governance and leadership within the academic community.

A college or university is an organization in that it is comprised of a definite group of people brought together in the pursuit of learning, making use of a fixed set of facilities, and having certain specified financial resources for carrying on its endeavor. In all of these particular characteristics the college or university is an organized enterprise. But a college or university is also an anarchy in terms of having somewhat general and vague objectives defined by each faculty member or academic department, seeking a work output by means of a technology largely devised by each faculty member, producing primarily a service whose value and utility tends to be different for each consumer.

To the extent that a college or university is an organization it tends to follow a certain pattern of activity and behavior involving leadership, support, and work differentiation. To the extent that it is an anarchy it tends to provide a substantial degree of personal freedom to faculty members to fix their own objectives, to devise their own work processes, to control their own allotment of time, to determine the service satisfaction of their consumers (or students), and to evaluate their own standards of performance.

In its organizational characteristics a college or university seeks to protect and perpetuate its existence. Within the enterprise authority is defined with some precision insofar as support of the collectivity is concerned. In its anarchical characteristics the enterprise accords faculty members and departments a maximum degree of academic freedom and a minimum of supervisory constraint. The college or university operates in peace and some kind of prosperity only if its organizational characteristics and its anarchical characteristics can co-exist in some degree of harmony. The college or university becomes a place of disharmony when organization and anarchy conflict.

The discord of the 1960's arose primarily I believe from two forces. One was faculty concern to be more extensively involved in the institutional affairs of the enterprise. The other was student concern about their exclusion from authority within the academic community. Faculty members were no longer content to restrict their role or interest to so-called academic affairs. They believed themselves entitled to a larger voice in decisions about budgets, about facilities, about public relations, about the maintenance of law and order. Students were no longer content to be the passive recipients of a revealed learning and to have their personal and social behavior governed by student conduct regulations enacted by faculties and boards of trustees. Students wanted to know how to use knowledge, and they wanted to use it now. At the same time they demanded that restrictive codes of behavior be eliminated.

One response to the complexities of governance within the academic community as revealed in the 1960's was an effort to contract a new structure of governance. As a result of Corson's book, I had written a little volume utilizing the phrase "academic community" and arguing that there were indeed various constituencies to be recognized and appeased within this community.[5] I was not certain how these constituencies were to be brought together except through some general process of consensus. Soon thereafter on various campuses persons and groups went to work to develop a community structure of governance.[6] The basic objectives in these new arrangements were to provide students with a share of authority and to merge the institutional and the instructional, the administrative and the academic, affairs of colleges of universities. The device for achieving these objectives was a community council or university senate bringing together in one body representatives of the faculty, of students, and of administrative staff. In a few instances representatives of the operating staff were also included in the council or senate.

From a structure and practice of organized anarchy some colleges and universities moved to a new structure of parliamentary government. In my book of 1974 I tried to set forth certain apparent defects in this new structure of governance and at the same time to suggest how the model of community governance could be strengthened and perhaps enabled to operate with some degree of achievement. I did not question the desirability of the community governance model; I was concerned about how to perfect the model once the decision has been made to move in this direction.

From my observation I perceived two glaring weaknesses in the ideas developed about a structure of community governance. One weakness was the failure to differentiate between policy and performance, between legislation and management. The other was the failure to provide for effective leadership within the academic community. If community governance was to work with some degree of satisfaction to all concerned, then these weaknesses had to be overcome.

It seems to me that in the endeavor to restructure the governance of our colleges and universities our governmental planners were more concerned with a redistribution of power than with arrangements to ensure organizational effectiveness. Student power was legitimatized by inclusion of representatives in a council or senate. Faculty power was enhanced by a limitation upon administrative power. But little attention was given to a realistic appraisal of the decision-making process within this new legislative structure. It was assumed that proper representation would ensure appropriate action.

One evidence of this kind of thinking was the general failure to provide for any leadership arrangements within a new community council. Moreover, it was assumed that management that is, work performance would automatically take care of itself. The important end

appeared to be faculty domination of legislative action, with a somewhat reluctant inclusion of students and administrators within the structure as a kind of necessary compromise.

To be sure, in establishing these new arrangements for governance, colleges and universities included a time-honored concession that the council or senate was intended to be advisory to the president and the board of trustees. Yet there was the clear implication that both had better be certain to follow the proffered advice.

In practice, I believe the new structures of governance quickly revealed various deficiencies. In the first place, legislative deliberation took a vast amount of time for faculty members, students, and administrators. Soon there were complaints that governance was not worth the cost. In the second place, the whole concept of a legislative body representing various constituencies of the academic community proved to be a more complicated piece of machinery to operate than any of its protagonists had foreseen. A representative legislative assembly is not a simple device to make effective. Presidents were uncertain about their leadership role in the new council or senate and tended to withdraw from assumption of a vigorous leadership for which they had not been prepared by previous experience. Faculty members were also somewhat uncertain about their new role. Quite willing to act on institutional affairs, they were less enthusiastic about legislating policies and procedures on academic affairs. And students, having won concessions about personal and social behavior, were less positive about desirable academic objectives. In the third place, the new instruments of governance were ambivalent in their attitude about management. Management of the primary programs and the support programs continued largely as in the past without a clear definition of role or of relationship to governance.

The really vital defect in these new structures of governance was one never foreseen by faculty members themselves. The new structures made possible the process of a strong internal and centralized decision-making which could become binding upon all members of the academic community. In other words, the new governance was an enemy of the whole practice of academic anarchy, or of individual faculty autonomy, that had developed over the past fifty or so years in the American college and university. The new structures of governance made possible the development of colleges and universities into self-governing communities. But in fact, faculty members tend to be little interested in government of any kind. They are primarily interested in the perpetuation of academic anarchy. They are not ready collectively to enact legislation clarifying educational purposes, defining instructional objectives, determining an effective instructional technology, establishing qualitative standards of student performance, and creating mechanisms to evaluate faculty work output. And even if faculties were ready to enact such legislation, there is some doubt that they are ready to abide by such legislation.

I perceive currently a tendency to withdraw from the whole concept of community governance. Students have achieved in large measure their immediate objectives, even if their concern with the interrelationship between learning and experience has been only partially resolved. Faculty members have found administrative affairs to be more troublesome than they expected, and having won concessions of information and of consultation, are more disposed than a few years ago to leave the tough decisions about priorities and fund raising to administrators. And administrators have found themselves more comfortable in the familiar role of institutional caretaker.

And once again the problems of caretaking are overwhelming. Enrollment losses, philanthropic disinclination in a time of plunging capital values, changing attitudes of governments, the ravages of inflation, the demands for accountability all of these circumstances have produced new situations threatening once again the very existence of colleges and universities as viable enterprises. Presidents and boards of trustees have their hands full.

At the end of 1974 there appears to be a kind of restlessness within the academic community, as in American society generally. Some faculty members seem to think that the escape from present dilemmas lies in collective bargaining rather than in community governance. Students seem to be more worried about their economic future than their social role. Administrators must find new roads to institutional survival. At the same time they see their internal role as different from that of the past. How different and in what ways the role will be different are the questions; the answers are but dimly perceived.

My own guess is that experiments for the moment in community governance have about run their course. Only further experience and inquiry will confirm or modify this impression. In the meantime I would guess also that little by little organized anarchy will prove vulnerable and impossible to sustain. The institutional model of governance will be gradually replaced by one in which institutional leadership perforce will exert ever more influence upon academic affairs. Necessarily, this new kind of institutional leadership will require much more extensive information sharing, more lengthy consultation, more careful sharing of authority than in the past. Someplace ahead is yet a new model of governance and leadership for our colleges and universities.

[1] Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974).

[2] John D. Millett, *Strengthening Community in Higher Education* (Washington: Management Division, Academy for Educational Development, 1974).

[3] John J. Corson, *Governance in Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960).

[4] Harold W. Dodds, *The Academic President – Educator or Caretaker* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962).

[5] John D. Millett, *The Academic Community* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962).

[6] The most useful discussion of the whole subject of community governance was produced not in this country but in Canada. See *Toward Community in University Government*, the Report of the Commission on the Government of the University of Toronto (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970). It is also instructive to inquire into the experience that followed the actual restructuring of university governance by the Parliament of the Province of Ontario in 1971.

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation grant to the Academy for Educational Development, Inc. in support of a continuing education program and an informational program for college and university presidents will terminate on December 31, 1974. Accordingly, this will be the last issue of *Management Forum*.